



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/502,099	07/22/2004	Hisatomi Hosaka	256369US2PCT	4012
22850	7590	02/22/2006	EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ABRAMS, NEIL	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2839	

DATE MAILED: 02/22/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/502,099

Applicant(s)

HOSAKA ET AL.

Examiner

Neil Abrams

Art Unit

2839

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12-1-2005
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 6-14, 26-39 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 10-14, 29-31 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 6-9, 26-28, 32-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 38, 39 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election of claims 6-9 is noted. Added claims 29-31 are not seen as directed to the elected invention and are included in Group II with withdrawn claims 10-14.

Applicant is asked to list dependent claims, if any that are not independently at issue, i.e. based on prior art, apart from their parent claims. Are claims 38, 39 frames known in prior art

1. Claims 8, 9, 32-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 8 is unclear, line 2, after "corresponding" - - said - - should be added and readability of claim on specific figures discussed in response.

Claim 9, line 2, should read - - on the second film- shaped supporting body - -.

Claim 32, lines 7-8 improperly incorporate a portion of claim 26 but leave out other aspects therefore the scope of claim 32 is unclear.

2. Claims 26-28, 32-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Soejima in view of Japan 22744, Tanioka, Eldridge 374, and Sato.

3. For claims 26, 32, Soejima figures 1, 4, includes a probe card 120 with beam 11 having a base end 13 and a contacts 12, and for claim 32 a column 122 and a second terminal 14. The contactor is not trapezoidal in shape. Japan, figure 10(b) and Tanioka at 12 use trapezoidal tips. Obvious to use such shapes in Soejima to provide good conduction at the mating point. Claim 28, figure 4 beam is bent upwardly. For claims 35, 37, Soejima card 120 lacks stops and alignment marks. Eldridge at 150 uses stops, Sato, figure 2 at 16a, b, c, includes marks on a probe card. Obvious to use such

features in Soejima to control probe bending and to correctly position the probe card relative to device tested.

4. Claims 6-9 and 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eldridge 013 in view of Japan 22744 and Tanioka.

5. Eldridge, figure 4B has film shaped body 408 with probes 402 adhered at bases, near 410 and with contactors at their tips (108 in figure 1A). The contactors are not trapezoidal. Japan and Tanioka are applied as above for this feature. Obvious to use such feature on Eldridge probe for better engagement during testing. Claims, 7-8 solder 410 is an adhesive material and strength can be detracted by heat. Claim 9, different directions shown in figures 4B, 5. Terms "used in" are met by figure 4B product. As alternative, figure 4A substrate 404 is read as film shaped and has probes 402 adhered thereto. Contactor feature treated as above.

6. For claim 7, 8 note discussion, column 15, and lines 38-43 as to substrate heated for loss of adherence to contacts. Note that term film may be read on a thin sheet such as substrate 404. For claims 26-28, figure 4B probe 402 applied as above.

7. Claims 6, 7, 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over IBM in view of Japan 22744 and Tanioka.


8. IBM has film 9, probe 11 adhered to the film and contactor 15. But lacks trapezoidal shape contactor. Obvious to use such shapes in view of Japan and Tanioka for reliable contacting. For claims 7, 9, obvious heat could detract probe adherence and that some probe would be differently oriented to surround wafer 1.

Art Unit: 2839

9. Claims 38 and 39 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

10. Claim 36 overcomes prior art.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Neil Abrams at telephone number 571-272-2089


NEIL ABRAMS
EXAMINER
ART UNIT 322